



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

materially prejudice the jury against him, so that any consent he might give would be given under coercion. It is therefore best to make it impossible for him to consent.

L. S.

ELECTRICITY—STREETS—INJURIES CAUSED BY OBSTRUCTIONS.—PORTER V. MUNICIPAL GAS CO. OF CITY OF ALBANY, 155 N. Y. SUPP. 633.—The defendant's electric light wire, strung diagonally across the street, 28½ to 40 feet above the ground, prevented firemen from raising an aerial ladder to the burning building, from which the plaintiff was, accordingly, forced to jump. In the suit for the resulting injuries to the plaintiff, *held*, that it was a question for the jury, whether the maintenance of electric light wires in the above manner by the defendant constituted negligence.

Those engaged in business requiring the use of electric currents are uniformly bound to take nothing less than the greatest possible care to safeguard customers and the public from accidents peculiar to the nature of electricity. *Smith's Admrs. v. Middlesboro Electric Co.*, 174 S. W. (Ky.) 773; *Cochran v. Young-Hartsell Mills Co.*, 85 S. E. (N. C.) 149; *Wade v. Empire Distributing Electric Co.*, 147 Pac. (Kan.) 63. There is usually a question for the jury at least, even in ordinary accidents not involving the source of this heavy responsibility, such as, for instance, the physical impact from falling wires. *Fitsimmons v. Phila. Rapid Transit Co.*, 56 Pa. Superior Ct. 365; *Walter v. Baltimore Electric Co.*, 109 Md. 327. Or from falling light globes. *Sweeney v. Edison Electric Illuminating Co. of Brooklyn*, 143 N. Y. S. 636; *Louisville Lighting Co. v. Owens*, 32 Ky. Law Rep. 283. But the question of an electric company's responsibility with regard to the use of the highway for modern fire-fighting is new. *Lambert v. Westchester Elevated R. R. Co.*, 191 N. Y. 248—cited in the principal case—involved injury to a fireman caused by striking against one of the defendant's poles, set close to the fire station alley, as the fireman was mounting the moving wagon. Here the defendant's negligence was held to be a question for the jury. The effect of the principal case is to extend the obligation of corporations stringing wires along the highway, so as to include not only taking very great precautions as to insulation and non-interference with traffic by the location of its poles and wires but also seeing to it that no obstruction is presented in such emergencies as fire. In the average narrow American business street this seems wellnigh impossible, without forbidding altogether the use of overhead wiring systems.

C. B.

MASTER AND SERVANT—INJURIES TO SERVANT—WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION ACT—CONSTRUCTION OF ACT—DISEASE AN ACCIDENT.—VENNEN V. NEWS DELLS LUMBER CO., 154 N. W. (Wis.) 640.—An employee's death was caused by typhoid fever contracted by reason of impure drinking water furnished by the master. *Held*, there is a right to compensation, for such a happening is an accident within the intent of the Workman's Compensation Act as 'being a personal injury accidentally sustained by the employee.'